Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
AUG 4 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1974

No. 75-192

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA EX REL.
STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION,
Petitioner,

v.

FARMERS AND MERCHANTS NATIONAL BANK,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ANDREW P. MILLER
Attorney General of Virginia

ANTHONY F. TROY
Deputy Attorney General

Supreme Court Building
1101 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

WILLIAM F. SCHUTT
Counsel, State Corporation Commission

Blanton Building
P. O. Box 1197
Richmond, Virginia 23209

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

OPINIONS OF COURTS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 2

STATUTES INVOLVED 2

QUESTION PRESENTED 4

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 4

ARGUMENT FOR GRANTING A WRIT 6

CONCLUSION 15

APPENDIX

Judgment of the Court of Appeals
May 5, 1975 ..... App. 1

Opinion and Order of the District Court
August 8, 1974 ..... App. 3

Letter Ruling of the Deputy Comptroller
November 9, 1972 ..... App. 15

TABLE OF CASES

Dunn v. First National Bank of Cartersville, 345 F.Supp. 853 (N.D. Ga. 1972) 8

First National Bank in Plant City, Florida v. Dickinson, 396 U.S. 122 (1969) 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12

First National Bank of Logan, Utah v. Walker Bank and Trust Company, 385 U.S. 252 (1966) 7, 8, 14

First National Bank of Smithfield, North Carolina v. Saxon, 352 F.2d 267 (4th Cir. 1965) 14

Michigan National Bank v. Saxon, Civ. No. 821-862 (D. D.C. 1962) 8

North Davis Bank v. First National Bank of Layton, 457 F.2d 820 (10th Cir. 1972) 8

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1974

No. .....

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA EX REL.
STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION,
Petitioner,

v.

FARMERS AND MERCHANTS NATIONAL BANK,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

OPINIONS OF THE COURTS BELOW

The judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit affirming the judgment of the district court is not reported. It is set forth in the Appendix, infra, at App. 1.

The opinion and order of the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia granting defendant's motion for summary judgment and dismissing the case is reported at 380 F.Supp. 568. It is set forth in the Appendix, infra, at App. 3.

JURISDICTION

Review of the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, entered May 5, 1975, is sought. Jurisdiction to review that judgment by writ of certiorari granted is conferred by 28 U.S.C. Section 1254.

STATUTES INVOLVED

12 U.S.C. Section 36(f)

The term "branch" as used in this section shall be held to include any branch bank, branch office, branch agency, additional office, or any branch place of business located in any State or Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia at which deposits are received, or checks paid, or money lent.

12 U.S.C. Section 36(c)(1)(2)

A national banking association may, with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, establish and operate new branches: (1) Within the limits of the city, town, or village in which said association is situated, if such establishment and operation are at the time expressly authorized to state banks by the law of the state in question; and (2) at any point within the state in which said association is situated if such establishment and operation are at the time authorized to state banks by the state law of the state in question by language specifically granting such authority affirmatively and not merely by implication or recognition, and subject to the restrictions as to location imposed by the laws of the state on state banks.

Section 6.1-39, Code of Virginia

(a) No bank or trust company heretofore or hereafter incorporated under the laws of this State shall be authorized

to engage in business in more than one place except that the State Corporation Commission, when satisfied that public convenience and necessity will thereby be served, may authorize banks having paid-up and unimpaired capital and surplus of fifty thousand dollars or over to establish branches within the limits of the city, town or county in which the parent bank is located or to establish branches elsewhere by merger with banks located in any other county, city or town.

This section shall not be construed to prohibit the operation of existing branch banks heretofore established.

The term "parent bank" shall be construed to mean the bank or banking office at which the principal functions of the bank are conducted. The location of a parent bank or of a branch bank may be moved if the State Corporation Commission determines that public convenience and necessity will be served by such move; but the location of a parent bank or of a branch bank may not be moved beyond the limits of the city, town or county in which it is located except through a merger with another bank.

(b) This section shall be construed to allow the merger of banks and the operation of the merged company of such banks, and to allow the sale of any bank to, and the purchase thereof through merger by, any other bank and the operation of such banks by the merged bank, provided that the State Corporation Commission shall be of the opinion and shall first determine that public convenience and necessity will be served by such operation, and provided further that, at the time of such merger the banks involved shall have been in actual operation for a period of five years or more. But in any case in which the Commission is satisfied that the public interest demands, on account of emergency conditions, that a merger be effected, it may enter an order to

such effect permitting such merger notwithstanding that the banks involved, or one or more of them, have not been in actual operation for five or more years.

(c) Notwithstanding the limitations of the foregoing paragraph the State Corporation Commission may, when satisfied that public convenience and necessity will thereby be served, authorize the establishment of branch banks in cities contiguous to the county or city in which the parent bank is located, and the establishment of branch banks in counties contiguous to the city in which the parent bank is located. Establishment of such branch may be by merger, consolidation, purchase of assets or creation of a new branch; but if the parent bank is located in a city such branches in the contiguous county may not be established more than five miles outside the city limits.

QUESTION PRESENTED

May a drive-in banking facility, which admittedly performs the functions of a branch bank, and which is located on a separate lot over two hundred feet from the nearest bank office, be deemed not a branch bank, as defined in 12 U.S.C. Section 36(f) and *First National Bank of Plant City, Florida* v. *Dickinson,* 396 U.S. 122 (1969), based on the theory that the facility is an integral part of the bank office?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Farmers and Merchants National Bank has its principal office in the city of Winchester, Virginia. In 1969, Farmers and Merchants (F&M) acquired by merger three offices in Front Royal, Warren County, Virginia, a town of fewer than 9,000 people, located roughly twenty miles from Winchester. The three Front Royal offices became branches of

the Winchester bank, with the result that Virginia branching law forbade further F&M branches in Front Royal.[1]

In January, 1974 Farmers and Merchants opened a three-window drive-in facility situated on property across the street and a block away from its Main Street office in Front Royal. Measured diagonally, from property line to property line, the lots are over 200 feet apart. The new drive-in is not connected to the Main Street office, and remains open on Saturday when the Main Street office is closed. It gives F&M conspicuous exposure to traffic on North Royal Avenue, Front Royal's main north-south thoroughfare, by means of a large, lighted, time-temperature advertising sign.

Admittedly, the drive-in functions identically with F&M's two other Front Royal branches. All three are essentially teller operations; they cash checks, receive deposits, open new accounts, and make credit card loans. In addition to the services offered at all other F&M locations in town, the Main Street branch processes and services loans.

Before beginning construction of the drive-in, F&M sought approval from officials with the Comptroller of the Currency. Based solely on two self-serving (and not entirely truthful) letters from F&M, the Deputy Comptroller ruled that, since the proposed facility would constitute an "integral part" of the Main Street branch, "neither approval nor certification of this office is required." (App. 15)

Only when the opening of the new facility was imminent did Virginia's Commissioner of Banking learn of it by way of a complaint. Upon investigation of the situation, the Com-

---

[1] Section 6.1-39(a) of the Code of Virginia permits branches "within the limits of the city or county in which the parent bank is located, or—elsewhere by merger with banks located in any other county or city."

Already Farmers and Merchants had expanded into Front Royal by merger, and had at its disposal legitimate methods of branching there; it *chose* the path which is the subject of this litigation.

missioner determined that the facility was a branch, and that it violated Virginia branching law, which is made applicable to national banks by 12 U.S.C. 36(c). When efforts to negotiate a legitimate solution to the problem failed, the Commonwealth tried to enjoin operation of the alleged branch; it sued for injunctive relief in the United States District Court alleging jurisdiction under Sections 1331, 1337, 2201, and 2202 of Title 28, United States Code.

Upon trial of the case the Banking Commissioner averred, and it was not disputed, that, based on consistent policy rulings of the state Bureau of Banking, no state bank would have been permitted to erect such a facility under like circumstances. The Court and the parties recognized and agreed:

(1) that if the facility *were* a branch, it was prohibited by law

(2) that federal law governed whether the facility was a branch

(3) that unquestionably banking functions were performed at the subject facility.

The opinion of the district judge noted the foregoing factors. The Court ruled that the subject facility was not a branch as defined in 12 U.S.C. Section 36(f) and in *Dickinson, supra*. The United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit affirmed the lower court in a terse, *per curiam* decision.

ARGUMENT FOR GRANTING A WRIT

The judgment of the district court in this case, affirmed by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, should be reviewed and corrected because the error it espouses poses a threat to

the dual banking system in the United States. At stake is the deliberate congressional policy of competitive equality between state and national banking systems.

That policy, i.e., that neither system shall have an advantage over the other as a result of unequal application of branching law, was announced in the McFadden Act of 1927, 44 Stat. 1228, as amended, codified in 12 U.S.C. § 36, and forms the very foundation of this nation's admirably successful dual banking system. The history, significance and purpose of the McFadden Act have been amply reviewed and approved by this Court in *First National Bank of Logan* v. *Walker Bank and Trust Co.*, 385 U.S. 252 (1966) and in *Dickinson, supra.*

Significantly, each of those two cases resulted from efforts by the Comptroller to skirt the McFadden Act mandate. In both instances, this Court's interpretation of the law bolstered the Act, and prevented the attempted evasion of its purpose. The instant case is representative of the Comptroller's latest (since *Dickinson*) assault on competitive equality in branching.

The method selected by Congress for effecting equality in branching is simple: Section 36(c) makes state branching law applicable also to national banks. Section 36(f) defines branch, thereby designating what facilities and activities in both systems shall be subject to branching rules. The scope of the definition in § 36(f) has been the subject of some controversy.

In *Dickinson, supra,* this Court was concerned with the issue, "What is a branch?," in the context of a depository with armored car pick-up service offered by a national bank in Florida, which state permitted no branching. An analysis of the opinion in that leading case reveals clearly the infirmities in the district court's approach to the present case.

Chief Justice Burger, in the majority opinion in *Dickinson,* noted that the power to expand or contract the definition of "branch" was the power to upset congressional purpose, i.e., competitive balance under law.[2] That was the reason Congress defined "branch" itself, he concluded.[3]

The Chief Justice reasoned that state law could not be permitted to widen the coverage of the term "branch," (thereby restricting branching activity). Similarly, we urge that the scope of "branch" must not be narrowed unilaterally by administrative rulings which modify or contradict § 36(f). That would abort the application of branching law in situations where it should come into play.

Dickinson, then, dictates that the threshold question, "Is it a branch?", be subject to a single standard: Section 36(f), as interpreted by this Court. Neither state nor federal agency can be permitted to expand or restrict its meaning. Yet, that is what has occurred in the present case and in other instances[4] where theories like "unity of operation"[5] have been allowed to encroach on the § 36(f) definition.

---

[2] "In short, the definition of 'branch' in 36(f) must not be given a restrictive meaning [by influence from outside § 36(f)] which would frustrate the Congressional intent [competitive equality] this Court found to be plain in *Walker Bank, supra.*" (bracketed material added.) 396 U.S. at 134.

[3] "But to allow the states to define the content of the term 'branch' would make them the sole judges of their own powers. Congress did not intend such an improbable result, as appears from the inclusion in § 36 of a general definition of 'branch.' " 396 U.S. at 133.

[4] *North Davis Bank* v. *First National Bank of Layton,* 457 F.2d 820 (10th Cir. 1972); *Dunn* v. *First National Bank of Cartersville,* 345 F.Supp. 853 (N.D. Ga. 1972); *Michigan National Bank* v. *Saxon,* Civ. No. 821-862 (D. D.C. 1962).

[5] Essentially the same rationale comes in various guises: "unity of operation"; "extension (or expansion) of an existing facility"; "integral part of the main office." All mean the same thing. All are especially useful for justifying a previously-reached result.

This Court in *Dickinson* interpreted and refined § 36(f):

> "Although the definition may not be a model of precision, in part due to its circular aspect, it defines the *minimum* content of the term 'branch'; by use of the word 'include' the definition suggests a calculated indefiniteness with respect to the outer limits of the term. However, the term 'branch bank' *at the very least* includes *any* [emphasis the Court's] place for receiving deposits or paying checks or lending money *apart from the chartered premises;* it may include more." (Emphasis added, except as noted) 396 U.S. at p. 135.

In applying *Dickinson* to the instant case, the key is the addition of the phrase "apart from the chartered premises."[6] By adding that significant phrase this Court said where banking functions cannot be performed (except as branching law permits). We contend that the words "apart from" should be given their plain and ordinary meaning (i.e., separate, not adjoining), especially since the context demands it, and since legal and practical considerations support using the normal rule of construction in this instance.

It is evident that a straightforward view of "apart from the chartered premises" and theories like "unity of operation" are totally at odds, and cannot co-exist. Any number of situations can occur where a facility is both apart from and dependent on an existing bank. Where will the line be drawn? Therefore, to legitimize "unity of operation" is to undermine completely the import of "apart from the chartered premises." That obvious truth was recognized even before *Dickinson,* when "unity of operation"

---

[6] It is worthwhile to note Representative McFadden's description of the definitional section of the Act: *"Any place outside of or away from* the main office where the bank carries on its business of receiving deposits, paying checks, lending money, or transacting any business carried on at the main office, is a branch." 68 Cong. Rec. 5816 (1927). 396 U.S. 134 (Note # 8) (Emphasis added).

was denounced as "too pliable and amorphous"—too nebulous a concept for use where definite guidelines were the rule. *Jackson* v. *First National Bank of Valdosta,* 246 F.Supp. 134, (M.D. Ga. 1965).[7]

It is submitted that the wisdom and correctness of the *Jackson* court was underscored by this Court's opinion in *Dickinson.*

Granted, *Dickinson* dealt primarily with whether a depository performed a banking function. ("Apartness" was not debated, since a mile separated bank and depository.) Nevertheless, the depository/pick-up service *was* totally dependent on the bank office, and operated in unity with it. When the activity in *Dickinson* was struck down as illegal branching, "unity of operation" was impliedly outlawed. On its facts, if not explicitly, *Dickinson* therefore refutes "unity of operation."

To summarize, *Dickinson,* the leading Supreme Court case defining "branch": (1) added the phrase "apart from the chartered premises"; (2) spoke strongly for a single definitional standard not subject to variation from outside influence, and; (3) on its facts tacitly overruled "unity of operation," the very basis of the lower court's judgment herein.

In the instant case, the district judge correctly pinpointed the issue: "whether the facility shall be deemed 'apart from the chartered premises'" (App. 5). But having properly rejected the most unreasonable, most repressive mean-

[7] "This court feels that the concept 'unity of operation' is too pliable and amorphous to be accepted here in support of the position that the disputed 'branch' apparently covered under Section 36(f) is really not a 'branch' but is in effect an 'expansion of an existing facility,' namely, the main banking house of the defendant. We feel that this is consistent not only with the letter of Section 36(c)(1) but also with the spirit of said statute. If in fact an interstice exists in this area of the statute law, this court would not feel justified in filling it with such a nebulous concept as 'unity of operation.' *The history of preserving the balance of competition between the two rival banking systems with some sort of definite guidelines militates strongly against such a position.*" (Emphasis added.) 246 F.Supp. at p. 139.

ing the phrase "could possibly" have (i.e., not physically attached to the existing office building), the court went astray when it shunned any attempt to interpret the phrase reasonably. Instead, it leaped to embrace an approach based on "relevant factors so as to accord with congressional purpose and common sense."[8] Such an approach, we believe, is fatal to consistent administration of the law, and is contrary to *Dickinson.*

The foregoing error, together with the court's patent failure to realize that banks compete in the realm of customer convenience as well as for territory,[9] suggests what we conceive to be its attitude about the case. It was as if it said, "The economic advantage Farmers and Merchants gained by building this drive-in is slight. It's really not that far away from the bank. Let's see if I can devise some basis for circumventing this 'apart from' language."

The court't rationalization of its conclusion fails, we submit. It purports to rely on common sense and congressional purpose. But common sense ideas of what bank branches do, and ordinary notions of separateness compel the conclusion that this is a branch. The facility in question is just like other F&M branches. Closer; but still separate.

Nor does congressional purpose support the "no branch" finding. The declared purpose of Congress is to maintain

[8] "A literal and mechanical application of the definition in section 36(f) as construed in *Dickinson, supra* could possibly encompass any free standing structure that performs one of the functions listed in section 36(f). However, it is apparent to this court that the phrase 'apart from the chartered premises' was not intended to be inclusive of all structures not physically attached to an existing office. No court, either before or after the Court's decision in *Dickinson,* has ever wielded this definition in so absolute a fashion; rather, courts have considered all relevant factors so as to accord with congressional purpose and common sense." 380 U.S. 572.

[9] "A bank customer must still drive to approximately the same area now served by the existing branch. Only customer convenience is affected." 380 U.S. 574.

competitive equality. Yet, in the present case, we know, by hypothesis, that a situation of imbalance exists; a national bank has done what a state bank, incontrovertibly, could not do. Congressional purpose already has been thwarted in this instance. Congressional policy gave no answer to the sole issue before the trial court, "Is it a branch?" On that question, Congress furnished only a definition—no more.

Moreover, the district court must forfeit any support it might claim from the policy of competitive equality, because of its patent misconception of the doctrine. Its understanding amounts to saying, simplistically, "if the Bank of Virginia down the block has a drive-in, F&M can have one, too."[10] Competitive equality means equal opportunity to branch under the law; it is not a guarantee that every bank can have facilities equal to his closest competitor's.

The most compelling reason why this Court should grant *certiorari,* and tell what meaning is to be given "apart from the chartered premises," is also a very potent practical reason for its approving definitional uniformity and banning an approach which utilizes "relevant factors" in support of a case-by-case application of the unity of operation rationale. That reason is the urgent need, on the part of state and federal agencies alike, for consistency and predictability in administering (not making) branching law. That is why Congress first set forth a definition of "branch." That is why *Dickinson* declared the single federal standard must govern all cases. If the definition is of uncertain or varying scope, branching law will apply haphazardly. Competitive equality will be destroyed.

We say this not merely because unity of operation is an amorphous concept, subject to being twisted and changed. There are also additional, baffling problems which are in-

[10] This without knowledge as to whether the competitor bank's drive-in was located on adjacent property, (it is), or not. (See App. 8, 9)

evitably caused by studying "relevant factors" in each individual case. Factors may be weighed differently on different occasions by different courts or administrators. New factors may be added. The present case illustrates the latter point perfectly: when the factors enumerated in previous cases favored finding a branch, the district court manufactured two brand new factors, which (combined) amounted to its saying, "F&M did the best they could to put the drive-in close to the bank."[11] We submit that a consistently fair reading of an already clear definition is vastly preferable to such wandering among "factors."

The jurisdictions are divided now on the issue herein. On one hand, the middle district of Georgia rejects unity of operation in *Jackson, supra;* however, the northern district of Georgia, the Tenth Circuit, and now the Fourth Circuit have adopted that approach. Many jurisdictions have not yet ruled on the question. Under these circumstances, review of the instant case by this Court is essential in any event.

We strenuously urge that the decision of the district court herein, affirmed by the Fourth Circuit, conflicts with an applicable decision by this Court in *Dickinson.* If that is true, the error needs correction, and reversal should be ordered.

Even if the district court is correct, and unity of operation based on "relevant factors" is a legally permissible *ratio decidendi,* a clarification by this Court, binding on all regulators, is demanded to restore competitive equality and to permit some semblance of consistent and predictable

[11] "Other factors this court has considered relevant to this case are (1) whether it was feasible for an existing bank office to physically attach the drive-in windows to the existing office, and (2) whether the freestanding facility could have been constructed closer to the existing bank office." 380 F.Supp. at p. 574.

Actually, the evidence herein failed to show any bona fide effort by Farmers and Merchants to obtain any one of several closer lots.

administration of bank branching law. It was regulatory disagreement over the meaning of this Court's phraseology which spawned the present controversy; this Court alone can put the issue to rest.

If further justification for review be required, it lies in this Court's power of supervision to correct departures from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings. This power should be exercised herein to overturn: (1) the district court's conspicuous misconception of the doctrine of competitive equality; (2) its unwarranted (though disclaimed) reliance on the findings of the Comptroller in the face of binding Fourth Circuit authority[12] that such reliance is forbidden, which authority had been advanced in argument; and (3) the trial judge's announced intention to find in favor of the defendant, if possible. All three of these errors were sanctioned by the court of appeals.

This Court should make the law at issue in this case; the matter is too broad and too important to be the subject of law made by the Comptroller, and ratified by the lower courts. In 1966 (*Walke Bank*) and 1969 (*Dickinson*) this Court refused to allow the Comptroller's rulings to thwart the purpose of the McFadden Act. We earnestly beseech that the Court now reaffirm its commitment to preserving that Act's congressional goal.

[12] *First National Bank of Smithfield, North Carolina* v. *Saxon*, 352 F.2d 267 (4th Cir. 1965). Noting that, as here, those controverting the Comptroller's ruling had been given no opportunity to be heard by that official, the court ruled: "Hence, there is no place in the review for an opening presumption of correctness of any fact which it may appear to the Court was adopted by the Comptroller for decision." 352 F.2d at p. 272. But see App. 12.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, a writ of *certiorari* should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

ANDREW P. MILLER
Attorney General of Virginia

ANTHONY F. TROY
Deputy Attorney General

Supreme Court Building
1101 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

WILLIAM F. SCHUTT
Counsel, State Corporation Commission

Blanton Building
P. O. Box 1197
Richmond, Virginia 23209

APPENDIX

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 74-2156

Commonwealth of Virginia, ex rel.
State Corporation Commission,

Appellant,

v.

Farmers and Merchants National Bank,

Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Harrisonburg. James C. Turk, Chief Judge.

Argued April 11, 1975 Decided May 5, 1975

Before Winter and Widener, Circuit Judges, and Merhige,* District Judge.

Anthony F. Troy, Deputy Attorney General of Virginia, (Andrew P. Miller, Attorney General of Virginia, and William F. Schutt, Assistant General Counsel of Virginia, on brief) for Appellant; Peter B. Work, (James F. Bell, Hones, Day, Reavis and Pogue on brief) for Amicus Curiae The Conference of State Bank Supervisers; Flournoy Largent, Jr., (Largent, Anderson and Larrick on brief) for Appellee.

---

* Honorable Robert R. Merhige, Jr., United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, sitting by designation.

Per Curiam:

By the instant suit, the Commonwealth of Virginia sought to prevent Farmers and Merchants National Bank from operating a drive-in banking facility approximately 204 feet from the rear of the Front Royal branch banking office located at Main and Crescent Streets in the town of Front Royal, Virginia. The drive-in facility was physically separated from the branch bank by at least one public street and by other property not owned by the bank. Injunctive relief was sought on the ground that the drive-in facility was a "branch" bank and allegedly could not be established and maintained under applicable state law. 12 U.S.C. § 36(c) and (f).

In a thorough and carefully considered decision, the district court concluded that the question of whether a banking facility constitutes a "branch" is a question of federal law (*First National Bank in Plant City, Fla.* v. *Dickinson,* 396 U.S. 122 (1969)); and, applying federal law, it concluded further that the drive-in facility which was the subject of litigation was not a "branch" but an extension of an existing banking office, the maintenance of which was authorized under both state and federal law. We think that the district court was correct in its conclusions for the reasons and the authorities set forth in its opinion. The judgment of the district court, is therefore,

AFFIRMED.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Civil Action No. 74-C-31-H

Commonwealth of Virginia, ex rel.
State Corporation Commission

v.

Farmers and Merchants National Bank

OPINION AND ORDER
Of August 8, 1974

The complainant in this action, Commonwealth of Virginia, brings suit on behalf of the Bureau of banking of the State Corporation Commission to enjoin the operation of a drive-in banking facility operated by defendant, Farmers and Merchants National Bank, in Front Royal, Virginia. Defendant is a national banking association, organized under the National Banking Act, 12 U.S.C. 21, *et seq.* (1945). Defendant has its principal office in the City of Winchester, Virginia, and has twelve branches in Virginia, including three branches in front Royal.

In September, 1972, defendant applied to the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States for permission to erect a drive-in facility approximately 200 feet from its existing branch office in Front Royal, Warren County, Virginia. On November 9, 1972, the Comptroller of the Currency, after reviewing information supplied by the defendant, advised the defendant that neither approval nor certification for the construction of the drive-in facility was required.[1] Defendant

[1] See footnote at the end of this opinion (App. 13).

then constructed the facility at a cost of approximately $118,000, and in January, 1974, the defendant began operation of the facility at the location proposed to the Comptroller. After the defendant commenced operation of the facility, the Commissioner of Banking of Virginia received from one of defendant's competitors in Front Royal a complaint as to the propriety of the defendant's facility. After investigation, the Commissioner, in March, 1974, advised defendant that the drive-in facility could not be legally operated under the branch banking laws of Virginia. Upon defendant's refusal to cease operation of its drive-in facility, plaintiff brought an action for declaratory and injunctive relief under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1337, 2201, and 2202. Since there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and disposition of this case rests upon the proper interpretation of state and federal banking laws, this case appropriately comes before this court on a motion for summary judgment.

The conditions under which a national bank may operate branch offices are contained in the National Bank Act (McFadden Act) 12 U.S.C. § 36.[2] Section 36(c) of that Act permits a national bank to operate a "branch" only when, where, and how state law would authorize a state bank to establish and operate such a branch. *First National Bank in Plant City, Fla.* v. *Dickinson,* 396 U.S. 122 (1969); *First National Bank of Logan, Utah* v. *Walker Bank & Trust Co.,* 385 U.S. 252 (1966). Virginia banking law permits branch banking in the city, town or county in which the parent bank is located. Also, branch banking is permitted in cities contiguous to the county or city in which the parent bank is located, and in counties contiguous to the city in which the parent bank is located, but where the parent bank is located in a city, such branches may not be established more than

[2] Footnote omitted; 12 U.S.C. § 36. Set forth *supra,* p. 2.

five miles outside the city limits. Branch banking elsewhere is accomplished by merger with banks located in any other county, city, or town.[3] Since defendant's parent bank is located in the City of Winchester, Frederick County, Virginia, defendant's operation of a "branch" in Front Royal, Warren County, Virginia would be unlawful under Virginia banking law and therefore unlawful under federal law. The dispositive issue in this case, then, is whether defendant's drive-in banking facility constitutes a "branch" within the definition of 12 U.S.C. § 36(f). This court finds after careful consideration of all facts and circumstances relevant to this issue that the defendant's operation of the drive-in facility in question does not so constitute a "branch" and is therefore lawful.

12 U.S.C. § 36(f) defines "branch" as follows:

> (f) The term "branch" as used in this section shall be held to include any branch bank, branch office, branch agency, additional office, or any branch place of business located in any State or Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia at which deposits are received, or checks paid, or money lent.

In *Dickinson, supra,* at page 135, the Court construed this section to mean:

> . . . The term "branch bank" at the very least includes *any* place for receiving deposits or paying checks or lending money apart from the chartered premises;

It is conceded that defendant's drive-in facility, *inter alia,* receives deposits. This court must therefore determine whether the facility shall be deemed "apart from the chartered premises."

[3] Footnote omitted; § 6.1-39 Code of Virginia. Set forth *supra,* beginning on p. 2.

A literal and mechanical application of the definition in section 36(f), as construed in *Dickinson, supra* could possibly encompass any free standing structure that performs one of the functions listed in section 36(f). However, it is apparent to this court that the phrase "apart from the chartered premises" was not intended to be inclusive of all structures not physically attached to an existing office. No court, either before or after the Court's decision in *Dickinson,* has ever wielded this definition in so absolute a fashion; rather, courts have considered all relevant factors so as to accord with congressional purpose and common sense. This was the approach followed by the Supreme Court in *Dickinson, supra* as well as other lower federal courts. *See, e.g., Jackson* v. *First National Bank of Valdosta,* 246 F. Supp. 134 (M.D. Ga. 1965); *Dunn* v. *First National Bank of Cartersville,* 345 F. Supp. 853 (N.D. Ga. 1972); *North Davis Bank* v. *First National Bank of Layton,* 457 F.2d 820 (10 Cir. 1972). This court quotes with approval the words of the court in the unreported case of *Michigan National Bank* v. *Saxon,* Civ. No. 821-862 (D.C. 1962), cited in *Dunn, supra:*

> It (additional office) does not mean, however, that every time a bank rents an additional room or additional offices in another building, as banks do sometimes when their business expands, that they are opening a new branch. The words "additional office" must be reasonably construed as meaning a separate and independent office operating in the same way as branch banks generally operate, and not merely additional office space to an existing facility.

In deciding this case, this court has been guided by the concerns inherent in the concept of "competitive equality,"

which lies at the foundation of 12 U.S.C. § 36(c) and the relevant decision of the Supreme Court.

In *Walker Bank, supra,* a unanimous court, per Mr. Justice Clark, articulated the legislative purpose of the McFaden Act as a response to the competitive tensions inherent in a dual system of state and national banking within a state. The court further promulgated the view, later endorsed in *Dickinson, supra,* that neither system, state nor national, shall have advantages over the other in the field of branch banking. This court believes it to be a logical corollary that federal banking law should not be construed in such a fashion as to artibrarily place a bank at a competitive disadvantage.

If a facility illegally functions as a "branch," the intended purpose of the branch cannot vitiate the effect or otherwise justify the operation of that facility. Nevertheless, those facts in the instant case which support the finding that the facility does not function as a "branch" also clearly evidence that the purpose of the contested facility was as an adjunct or annex to the existing branch office. No attempt was made to expand in a material way the geographical region served by the branch office. Consideration was given by defendant to the possibility of expanding the existing office to include a drive-in window; but given the physical location of the office, such construction was not feasible. Plaintiff concedes that had construction been feasible, either in the municipal parking lot immediately behind the branch office or in the lot adjacent to the building, no objection would have been asserted.

Viewed in the light of these facts and present Virginia branch banking law, the question reduces to whether a bank shall be placed at a possible permanent competitive disadvantage in meeting the needs, preferences, and modern banking habits of its customers because of its physical loca-

tion, established in most instances long before such needs are apparent. This court believes that the answer must be a qualified no.

In *Dickinson, supra,* on which plaintiff heavily relies, the court considered the case of an armored car mobile service center. That facility clearly fell within the language as well as the spirit of 12 U.S.C. § 36(f). As the court recognized, that case involved a clear, systematic attempt to secure branch banking privileges prohibited under state law. *Id.* at 138. Such is not the situation in this case. Defendant erected its facility as close to its existing bank as conditions permitted. Such drive-in facilities are permitted under state law, and had defendant been benefited by the fortuity of having located where a drive-in window could have been physically attached to the existing office, the operation of such a facility would not have been challenged. This court cannot, therefore, embrace the arbitrary position that a bank's inability to attach physically a drive-in facility to an existing office must automatically and mechanically qualify an free-standing structure as a "branch." To do so would be so arbitrary as to undercut the very concept of "competitive equality." The nature of our analysis must then focus on at what point a free-standing facility is so situated relative to an existing bank office that it can reasonably be said to function as a qualitatively distinct and separate service facility "apart from the chartered premises." In order to determine when a facility is so far detached from an existing office as to constitute a separate "branch," we must identify those operative concerns basic to the federal statute and the court's decision in *Dickinson, supra.* This court discerns in the Act and the relevant Supreme Court decision two basic factors, central to the consideration of whether a facility constitutes a "branch":

(1) whether a facility expands in a material way customer access to banking service in a geographical area not previously served;

(2) whether the facility is so situated physically as to give a bank a material competitive advantage in securing customers.

In order to determine the presence or absence of these two often unarticulated factors, courts have considered certain data relevant. These have included (1) the distance separating the facility from the existing bank office, (2) the number of intervening structures, (3) the lack of physical connection, such as by pneumatic tubes, between the facility and the existing bank office, and (4) the economic effect of the facility on the balance of competition between competing banks. *See, e.g., Jackson* v. *First National Bank of Valdosta, supra; Dunn* v. *First National Bank of Cartersville, supra; North Davis Bank* v. *First National Bank of Layton, supra.* Other factors this court has considered relevant to this case are (1) whether it was feasible for an existing bank office to physically attach the drive-in windows to the existing office, and (2) whether the free-standing facility could have been constructed closer to the existing bank office. In making these determinations, no single factor impresses this court as controlling; nor do any hard and fast rules concerning such factors as distance of separation recommend themselves. Only after considering all the relevant factors and circumstances peculiar to this case has this court determined that the defendant's drive-in facility does not constitute a "branch."

The facts of the cases cited in support of plaintiff's position are clearly distinguishable from the case at bar.

Plaintiff urges this court to adopt as dispositive of this case the Supreme Court's decision in *Dickinson, supra.* In

Dickinson a national bank attempted to provide its customers with the services of an armored mobile service center and an off-premises receptable for deposits. The armored car serviced individual customers at their place of business. Florida banking proscribed all branch banking. The court found that the armored car and deposit receptable impaired the "competitive equality" of state and national banks by serving customers in areas other than those served by the main office. In the instant case, this court finds that the drive-in facility does not materially increase the region of customer service so as to impair the existing competitive balance. A bank customer must still drive to approximately the same area now served by the existing branch. Only customer convenience is affected.

Plaintiff further cites *Jackson* v. *First National Bank of Valdosta, supra* for the proposition that the concept of "unity of operation" is not applicable to a physically separate facility with respect to an existing office. *Jackson, supra* involved a drive-in facility approximately 300 feet away from an existing office and further separated by an alley and ten intervening buildings containing unrelated businesses. Considering the factors listed in this opinion as relevant, the district court found that the facility constituted a "branch" and that the concept of "unity of operation" was not supported by the facts of that case.

Other courts have, however, recognized the validity of that concept in appropriate cases. *See Dunn, supra; North Davis, supra. Dunn, supra* involved an installment loan building 40 feet from the main building and separated by an intervening street. After concluding that the loan building did not threaten the existing competitive balance within the local banking community, the court held the loan building not to be a "branch" but only an integrated extension of an existing office. The Court of Appeals *in North Davis,*

supra likewise held that a drive-in facility, similar to defendant's, erected across the street from an existing office was not a "branch." In so holding, the court adopted the language of the Utah Supreme Court in *First National Bank of Logan* v. *Walker Bank & Trust Co.,* 19 Utah 2d 18, 425 P.2d 414 (1967) that the facts of the case "portrays a single, integrated banking operation at a banking house, expanded in the manner described to accommodate customers coming to that same banking house." 457 F.2d at 824.

Plaintiff lastly refers this court to past rulings of the Virginia State Corporation Commission (SCC) that certain facilities similar to the contested facility are "branches." Because each facility must be judged on the facts and circumstances peculiar to that facility, this court feels that the previous rulings of the SCC are not necessarily inconsistent with the court's disposition of this case. This court in passing only ventures the view that the rulings in those cases may have been affected by the location of the proposed facilities in shopping centers, thus increasing to a significant degree access to customers. In any event, though this court has given those rulings due consideration, the decisions of the Commission are not binding precedent. While branch banking by national banks is subject to the restrictions of State law, what constitutes a "branch" is a threshold question controlled by federal law. *Dickinson, supra* at 134. As the Court stated in *Dickinson, supra:*

> Admittedly, state law comes into play in deciding how, where, and when branch banks may be operated, *Walker Bank, supra,* for in § 36(c) Congress entrusted to the States the regulation of branching as Congress then conceived it. But to allow the States to define the content to the term "branch" would make them the sole judges of their own powers. Congress did not intend

such an improbable result, as appears from the inclusion in § 36 of a general definition of "branch."

In reaching this decision, the court has considered the fact that the drive-in facility has hours different from those of the existing branch, and that the facility and the branch are not connected by pneumatic tubes. Though these two factors may weigh in favor of labelling this facility a "branch," given all the circumstances of this case, these factors alone do not justify such a result. This is particularly true when one considers that a drive-in facility physically attached may also have hours different from the rest of the office.

The court is well aware of the problems inherent in its refusal to adopt the simple expedient of labeling all free-standing structures as separate "branches." This court is comforted, however, in its knowledge that a case by case consideration will do greater justice and better comport with legislative intent and judicial sense. Though this court has engaged in an independent consideration of all factors relating to this case and has made an independent judgment based on its findings, this Court is further supported in its decision by the well established principle that the Comptroller's determination will be upheld in the absence of arbitrary and capricious conduct. *Dunn, supra;* cf. *Sterling National Bank of Davie* v. *Camp,* 431 F.2d 514 (5th Cir. 1970).

This court based on its above opinon hereby grants defendant's motion for summary judgment and dismisses this case with prejudice and it is so ORDERED.

[1] Richard J. Blanchard, Deputy Comptroller of the Currency for Mergers and Branches filed the following affidavit in support of the decision:

"I, Richard J. Blanchard, being duly sworn, depose and say as follows:

1. I am Deputy Comptroller of the Currency for Mergers and Branches, being duly appointed such by the Comptroller of the Currency. I have served as Deputy Comptroller since 1964.

2. I make the affidavit on the basis of my personal knowledge and of the records of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

3. On September 22, 1972, Farmers and Merchants National Bank (hereinafter "Farmers"), a national banking association whose main office is located in Winchester, Virginia, requested the approval of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency for the proposed expansion of its East Main Street branch office located in Front Royal, Virginia.

4. On November 1, 1972, Farmers communicated further information to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency regarding this proposed expansion.

5. From the information supplied on the above two dates the Comptroller's Office concluded:

(a) The existing premises of Farmers' branch office on East Main Street in Front Royal was inadequate to serve its customers properly;

(b) The branch office had no parking facilities for the use of its customers, who often were forced to park several blocks away and walk that distance to the office to transact business;

(c) The branch office had no facilities for drive-up banking, and thus could not provide its customers with this service, subjecting them to the inconvenience of 'horse and buggy day banking' rather than making available the more convenient and efficient drive-in service now routinely provided by many of Farmers' competitors;

(d) Physical modifications to the existing premises of the branch to provide such parking and drive-up facilities and to otherwise ensure adequate customer service were explored by Farmers architect and builder and found unfeasible;

(e) No other property contiguous to the branch office was available for expansion since existing buildings were unsuitable to satisfy the needs of Farmers' customers;

(f) The only reasonably available premises for expansion was a tract of land located approximately 200 feet from the existing

branch, and out of necessity, this was purchased for the purpose of expansion to provide needed customer services;

(g) There were no intervening structures between the existing branch and the tract of land acquired for the expansion;

(h) The additional installation on the tract of land was to be comprised of a parking area and a drive-up structure;

(i) The drive-up structure was to provide only limited banking services to present customers in the same customer service area as the existing branch and immediate building;

(j) All transactions engaged in at the drive-up structure would be processed at the existing branch; and

(k) The drive-up structure would be entirely dependent upon the branch, and only together could they provide complete banking services to Farmers' East Main Street Front Royal customers.

6. In determining whether a proposed additional installation, adjunctive to an existing branch or main office, amounts to the establishment of a branch or merely the establishment of an integral part of the existing office, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency examines all of the facts and circumstances surrounding the proposed additional installation.

7. The factors weighed by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency include the distance separating the additional and existing banking service areas, the presence or absence of any intervening structure, the presence or absence of any physical connection between the two installations, and the economic effect of the additional banking service area upon the balance of competition within the banking community. No single factor is controlling.

8. On November 9, 1972, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency determined, from an examination of all pertinent factors, that the proposed addition to Farmers' East Main Street branch in Front Royal, would be so closely tied to the existing branch structure as to be an integrated part thereof, and that together they would constitute a geographical and functional unity.

9. Based upon this information, therefore, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency concluded that the addition was a mere extension of the existing branch office rather than a branch separate and apart therefrom, and that consequently, no approval or certification was required. Farmers was so advised."

LETTER RULING OF THE DEPUTY COMPTROLLER

THE ADMINISTRATOR OF NATIONAL BANKS
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20220

(Seal Omitted)

November 9, 1972

Office of the Comptroller of the Currency

Mr. W. M. Feltner, President
Farmers and Merchants National Bank
Winchester, Virginia 22601

Dear Mr. Feltner:

This is to acknowledge your letter of September 22, 1972, wherein you propose to install a drive-in facility to be operated in unity with your Front Royal Branch. According to your letter, the facility would be approximately 200 feet north from the Front Royal Branch.

It appears to this Office the contemplated facility will constitute an integral part of the branch. Accordingly, neither approval nor certification by this Office is required.

Very truly yours,

/s/ R. J. Blanchard
Deputy Comptroller of the Currency

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
AUG 29 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM 1975

No. 75-192

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, *Ex Rel.*
STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION,
Petitioner,

v.

FARMERS AND MERCHANTS NATIONAL BANK,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION

FLOURNOY L. LARGENT, JR., ESQ.
Largent, Anderson and Larrick
25 East Boscawen Street
P. O. Box 444
Winchester, Virginia 22601

PRESS OF BYRON S. ADAMS PRINTING, INC., WASHINGTON, D. C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
QUESTION	2
STATUTES INVOLVED	2
STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
ARGUMENT	4
CONCLUSION	12

TABLE OF CASES

First National Bank in Plant City, Florida v. *Dickinson, et al.*, 396 US 122 (1969) 4, 5, 8, 9, 10

Jackson v. *First National Bank of Valdosta*, 246 F. Supp. 134 (1965) 5, 6, 10

Dunn v. *First National Bank of Cartersville*, 345 F. Supp. 853 (1972) 6

Michigan National Bank v. *Saxon* (Unreported) Civ. No. 821-862 (D., D.C. 1962) 7

North Davis Bank v. *First National Bank of Layton*, 457 F.2d 820 (1972) 7

Driscoll v. *Northwestern National Bank of St. Paul*, 349 F. Supp. 245 (1972) 8

First National Bank v. *Walker Bank and Trust Company*, 385 US 252 (1966) 11

First National Bank of Fairbanks v. *Camp*, 465 F.2d 586 (1972) 11

Nebraskans for Independent Banking, Inc. v. *The Omaha National Bank* (Unreported) No. 75-1109, Nebraska, United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, August 5, 1975 9

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM 1975

No. 75-192

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, *Ex Rel.*
STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION,
Petitioner,

v.

FARMERS AND MERCHANTS NATIONAL BANK,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion and order of the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia is reported at 580 F.Supp. 568 and is set forth in the Appendix, App. 3 filed herein with the Petition.

The judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit affirming the judgment of the district court is not reported and is set forth in the aforesaid Appendix, App. 1.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdictional requirements are adequately set forth in the Petition.

QUESTION

The sole question in this case is whether the Court of Appeals erred in affirming the judgment of the United States District Court in this case.

STATUTES INVOLVED

The pertinent statutes involved in this case are 12 U.S.C. § 36; § 36(c); § 36(c)(1) and (2); and§ 36(f).

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On August 16, 1972, an option agreement was executed by the respondent to purchase property for the erection of a drive-in facility as an extension of the Front Royal branch banking office located at Main and Crescent Streets.

On September 22, 1972, application was made to the Comptroller of the Currency for approval to erect a drive-in facility, and, on November 9, 1972, the Comptroller concluded that the addition was a mere extension of the existing banking office rather than a branch separate and apart therefrom and that consequently no approval or certification was required.

On November 24, 1972, the respondent acquired title to the said property by deed recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Warren County, Virginia. Construction was commenced in July of 1973 to erect the drive-in facility. The facility was completed in January of 1974 and opened on or about January 23, 1974.

The property on which the facility is located is 204 feet from the rear of the branch office and separated by Crescent and Peyton Streets; the said property is bounded on the North by a residence and a school; bounded on the East by Crescent Street; bounded on the South by Peyton Street, and on the West by North Royal Avenue.

The branch banking office located at Main and Crescent Streets is bounded on the South by Main Street; on the East by a commercial building at the time the facility was constructed; on the North by a municipal parking lot and on the West by Crescent Street.

The drive-in facility located on the bank's customer parking lot was constructed on the closest available property. There are no intervening structures. There are no pneumatic tubes connecting the drive-in facility with the branch; however, the respondent agreed to make this installation if it was necessary.

The drive-in facility has strictly a teller function and all of the business transacted is processed at the Main Street office. It is manned by one full-time teller; has no branch manager; does not maintain separate records; does not have a vault; has the same telephone number and is serviced by an extension, and its employee is a part of the Main Street branch office.

The parking area on which the drive-in facility is located makes it possible for customers to avail themselves of the services of the Main Street Office, which include the making of loans, safe deposit boxes, paying and receiving and general banking.

ARGUMENT

I. Decisions Below

The district court did not err and it correctly determined as a matter of federal law that the facility was not a branch.[1]

The Court of Appeals did not err in affirming the judgment of the district court.[2]

II. FEDERAL LAW

The petitioner seeks review of the decision of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals because it poses a threat to the dual banking system of the United States. There is nothing in the record of this case to support such a contention. The policy of competitive

[1] The petitioner's contention that the district court placed any reliance on the action taken by the Comptroller is erroneous. Reference is made to the Opinion and Order of The Honorable James C. Turk, District Judge, in which he stated:

> "The Court is well aware of the problems inherent in its refusal to adopt the simple expedient of labeling all free-standing structures as separate branches. This Court is comforted, however, in its knowledge that a case-by-case consideration will do greater justice and better comport with legislative intent and judicial sense (and) . . . this Court has engaged in an independent consideration of all factors relating to this case and had made an independent judgment based on its findings . . ."

[2] "In a thorough and carefully considered decision, the district court concluded that the question of whether a banking facility constitutes a "branch" is a question of federal law (First National Bank in Plant City, Fla. v. Dickinson, 396 U.S. 122 (1969)); and, applying federal law, it concluded further that the drive-in facility which was the subject of litigation was not a "branch" but an extension of an existing banking office, the maintenance of which was authorized under both state and federal law. We think that the district court was correct in its conclusions for the reasons and the authorities set forth in its opinion. The judgment of the district court, is therefore, AFFIRMED."

equality has no application to the case before this Court. The facility was found to be an extension of an existing banking office and there is no question that it can be operated under the laws of Virginia.

If, on the other hand, a determination had been made that the facility was a branch, then it could not have been operated under the laws of Virginia.

The Courts have had no difficulty in determining whether a facility is in fact a branch based upon the criteria established by the Supreme Court in the case of *First National Bank in Plant City, Florida* v. *Dickinson, et al,* 396 US 122(1969), and a consideration of the factors enunciated in the case of *Jackson* v. *First National Bank of Valdosta,* 246 F.Supp. 134 (1965).

In the Dickinson case, *supra,* the Court stated:

> "We reject the contention made by amicus curiae National Association of Supervisors of State Banks to the effect that state law definitions of what constitutes "branch banking" must control the content of the federal definition of § 36(f). Admittedly, state law comes into play in deciding how, where, and when branch banks may be operated, Walker Bank, supra, for in § 36(c) Congress entrusted to the States the regulation of branching as Congress then conceived it. But to allow the States to define the content of the term "branch" would make them the sole judges of their own powers. Congress did not intend such an improbable result, as appears from the inclusion in § 36 of a general definition of "branch". "
>
> * * *
>
> "The term 'branch' as used in this section shall be held to include any branch bank, branch office, branch agency, additional office, or any branch place of business . . . at which deposits are received, or checks paid, or money lent."

"Although the definition may not be a model of precision, in part due to its circular aspect, it defines the minimum content of the term "branch;" by use of the word "include" the definition suggests a calculated indefiniteness with respect to the outer limits of the term. However, the term "branch bank" at the very least includes *any* place for receiving deposits or paying checks or lending money apart from the chartered premises; it may include more."

The factors referred to in the *Valdosta* case, *supra,* namely:

1. The distance separating the main banking house and the banking facility;
2. Number of intervening structures;
3. Lack of physical connection within the main banking office and the drive-in facility;
4. The economic effect of the drive-in facility on the balance of competition between the plaintiff bank and the defendant bank;

have been adhered to in other cases to determine whether an additional banking installation is apart from existing banking premises or merely an extension thereof.

In the case of *Dunn* v. *First National Bank of Cartersville,* 345 F.Supp. 853 (1972), Court, using these factors considered, found distinguishable characteristics in that:

1. The distance separating the facility and the main building was 40 feet.
2. There was a street but no building between the facility and the main building.
3. A pneumatic tube connected the facility and the main building.

4. There was no expansion into a new banking market and consequently no imbalance was created in the existing scheme of competition between local banks.

In the unreported case of *Michigan National Bank* v. *Saxon,* Civ. No. 821-862 (D., D.C. 1962), the Court stated:

"It does not mean, however, that every time a bank rents an additional room or additional offices in another building, as banks do sometimes when their business expands, that they are opening a new branch. The words 'additional office' must be reasonably construed as meaning a separate and independent office, operating in the same way as branch banks generally operate, and not merely additional office space to an existing facility."

The Court held the facility not to be a branch in the *Michigan National Bank* case, *supra,* and the facts were:

1. The facility to be 500 feet away from the branch office erected on a parking lot.
2. No intervening structures.
3. A pneumatic tube connecting the facility and branch office.
4. There was no expansion into a new banking market and consequently no imbalance was created in the existing scheme of competition between local banks.

In the case of *North Davis Bank* v. *First National Bank of Layton,* 457 F.2d 820 (1972), the Court held that the facility was not a branch based upon the following facts:

1. The proposed facility was 100 feet away from the present banking office across a street 66 feet wide on a bank owned lot.

2. *There were no intervening* structures between the facility and branch office.
3. Pneumatic tubes connected the facility and the present office.
4. The facility provides a service necessitated by increasing demand to accommodate customers who arrive at the bank in automobiles. There was no expansion into a new banking market and consequently no imbalance was created in the existing scheme of competition between local banks.

The Court, relying on the *Dickinson* case, *supra,* further stated:

> "There is no fixed test for determining what constitutes a branch bank. Each case must be considered on its own facts."

In the case of *Driscoll* v. *Northwestern National Bank of St. Paul,* 349 F. Supp. 245 (1972) [3], the facility was held not to be a branch bank based upon the following facts:

1. Three walk-up television tellers were located in the same building as the main banking office approximately 300 feet from the main banking floor.

[3] The *Driscoll* case, supra, has been reversed and remanded to the comptroller of the Currency for review on the ground that space which the bank originally planned to occupy between the contested TV teller units and the main banking floor has been occupied by other businesses. The Appellate Court did not refute the basis upon which the Comptroller and the district court determined the TV teller units merely an extension of the existing premises. Pursuant to the Court's order, the Comptroller of the Currency reviewed this case and on March 13, 1975, found there were no material changes in the facts.

2. Pedestrian concourse connected the facility and the main office as well as being connected by a pneumatic tube, telephone and TV cables.
3. There was no expansion into a new banking market and consequently no imbalance was created in the existing scheme of competition between local banks.

In the unreported case of *Nebraskans for Independent Banking, Inc.* v. *The Omaha National Bank,* (No. 75-1109, Nebraska, United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, August 5th, 1975) [4], the Court found the drive-in facility to be an integrated extension of the main bank and not a branch based upon the following facts:

1. The drive-in facility was located 102 feet from the main bank and as close to the main bank as was practicable.
2. Connected by a pneumatic tube system.
3. The operation of the facility was integrated with the main bank and directed by officers in the main bank.
4. The drive-in facility did not expand in a material way customer access in a geographical area not previously served.

The facts in the *Dickinson* case, *supra,* are clearly distinguishable from those in the case before this Court. Application was there made to engage in an activity incidental to its banking function which activity was to be carried on one mile from its existing banking office.

[4] A motion for rehearing has been filed in this case.

It did not involve the extension of the premises of the existing office nor was this contention ever made.

The Court held that:

> "Since the putative deposits are in fact received by a bank facility *apart from* its chartered place of business, we are compelled in construing § 36(f) to view the place of delivery of the customer's cash and checks accompanied by a deposit slip as an additional office or branch place of business at which deposits are received." Emphasis added.

In this case the District Court made its finding, after engaging in an independent consideration of all of the factors, that the facility was not apart from its chartered place of business.

III. Competitive Equality

In determining whether a facility is in fact a branch, one of the criteria established in the *Valdosta* case, *supra,* was economic effect of drive-in facility to the balance of competition between the plaintiff bank and the defendant bank.

This consideration is not to be confused with the doctrine of competitive equality. It is nothing more than one of the factors used by the Courts to make a determination of what is *apart from* the chartered premises. Emphasis added.

Its significance in the case before this Court lies in the fact that the extension did not pierce a new competitive market. It was located as close to the existing banking office as possible with no intervening structures; provided a drive-in facility together with parking for existing bank customers; faced the existing banking office; and was bounded on the North by a resi-

dence and a school, on the East by Crescent Street, on the South by Peyton Street, and on the West by North Royal Avenue.

On the other hand, "competitive equality" as intended by Congress and enunciated by the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Walker Bank* case, *infra,* and *Dickinson* case, *supra,* is simply an expression that national and state chartered banks should be *equal* with respect to their opportunity to establish branch banks. Consequently, where it is determined that branch banking is not being engaged in, the doctrine of "competitive equality" does not apply.

Thus, the Supreme Court, in the case of *First National Bank* v. *Walker Bank and Trust Company* 385 US 252 (1966), stated:

> "It appears clear from this resumé of the legislative history of § 36(c)(1) and (2) that Congress intended to place national and State banks on a basis of "competitive equality" insofar as branch banking was concerned."

More recently the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in *First National Bank of Fairbanks* v. *Camp,* 465 F.2d 586 (1972) held that:

> "National banks are to be subject to the same statutory restrictions on branch establishment as are state banks in each state."

Competitive equality is restricted to whether branching is permitted under state law. Once a determination is made that the facility is an extension of an existing national branch bank, the services offered, the customer convenience, access, size and type of signs, size or color of the building, hours, and number of employees are not factors subject to restrictions by state law.

CONCLUSION

The definition of what constitutes branch banking is controlled by federal law. State law definitions or the rulings of the State Banking Commission are not applicable.

There is no issue of competitive equality in the case.

Each case must be determined on its own facts. The Judge in the district court based his judgment on "an independent consideration of all factors relating to this case" and made an independent judgment based on his findings. The Court of Appeals referred to the judgment of the district court as a "thorough and carefully considered" decision and affirmed it.

It is respectfully submitted that the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

FARMERS AND MERCHANTS NATIONAL BANK, *Respondent*

FLOURNOY L. LARGENT, JR., *Counsel*

FLOURNOY L. LARGENT, JR.
LARGENT, ANDERSON & LARRICK
25 East Boscawen Street
P. O. Box 444
Winchester, Virginia 22601